



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

## RECENT CASES.

APPEAL—WAIVER—STIPULATIONS—AVOIDANCE—ARTHUR D. JONES CO. v. SPOKANE VALLEY LAND & W. CO., 87 PAC. 65 (WASH.).—*Held*, that where parties to a suit made a stipulation that any appeal taken from the judgment of the trial court should be taken in time to be heard at a certain date otherwise to be dismissed, a mistake by counsel as to the date of the commencement of the term was not a sufficient cause to avoid the dismissal. *Fulton, J., dissenting.*

The right of appeal is favored in the law and will not be held to have been waived except on clear and decisive grounds. *Hixon v. Oneida County*, 82 Wis. 520. Nevertheless, the right of appeal may be waived by an agreement supported by sufficient consideration. *Mackey v. Daniel*, 59 Md. 484. But not if agreement was the result of fraud, mistake, or surprise. *Town of Alton v. Town of Gilmanton*, 2 N. H. 520. Nor in criminal cases, *Smith v. Commonwealth*, 14 S. & R. (Pa.) 69. Such an agreement does not take away the right of the court to review on writ of error. *Putnam v. Churchill*, 4 Mass. 516. The attorney-general may waive his right of appeal by parol agreement and the same is binding on his successor. *Peo. v. Stephens*, 52 N. Y. 306. While there seem to be no cases involving mistake as applied to an agreement of this kind, it has been held, in the absence of any agreement, that an omission to file appeal papers owing to a mistake of fact, is not a sufficient cause to avoid dismissal of the appeal. *Gill v. Hudson*, 14 La. 203; *Rain v. Thomas*, 12 Fla. 493.

ASSAULT AND BATTERY—DAMAGES—FRIGHT OF WIFE.—HUTCHINSON v. STERN, 101 N. Y. SUP. 145.—*Held*, that the plaintiff in an action for an assault committed on him in the presence of his wife, cannot recover for injuries to the wife, occasioned by fright, and subsequent loss of service of the wife. *Kruse and Spring, J. J., dissenting.*

The general rule is that pain of mind is only the subject of damages when connected with bodily injury. *Morse v. Duncan*, 14 Fed. 396. However, this is subject to the qualification that a recovery for mental injuries and suffering alone is not precluded in cases of wilful tort. *Williams v. Underhill*, 71 N. Y. Sup. 291. So where plaintiff's wife was sick so that they could not move at the termination of his lease, and defendant started to tear down the house, exciting the sick woman and filling her room with dust, so that she had to be removed and shortly died, the defendant was held liable, though deceased suffered no immediate personal injury, and her death was due solely to fright and excitement. *Preiser v. Wielandt*, 62 N. Y. Sup. 890. But where the fright and mental suffering was not caused by a wilful tort but by an accident, no action can be maintained to recover the damages thereby sustained. *Lehman v. Brooklyn City Ry. Co.*, 47 Hun. 355. No well considered case has held that fright alone, not resulting from some physical injury to the person, will sustain an action for negligence. *Ewing v. Pittsburg C. and St. L. Ry. Co.*, 147 Pa. 40.

BILLS AND NOTES—IRREGULAR INDORSERS—LIABILITY—GOLDING SONS CO. v. CAMERON POTTERY CO., 55 S. E. 396 (W. VA.).—*Held*, that when a payee